

REMARKS

Claims 23-64 remain in this application, with Claims 2, 4, 7, 9-11, and 14-22 canceled, and new Claims 23-64 added. The specification has been amended to insert a copyright notice directed towards the materials in the appendix. By these amendments, no new matter has been added. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and review of the application as amended.

New Claims 23-64 are intended to more distinctly claim specific embodiments of the invention that are disclosed in the specification. There are three independent method Claims 23, 30, and 37, and three related independent system Claims 44, 51, and 58. Support for the added claims may be found throughout the specification, and particularly in "The Mousetrap Programmer's Guide" included in the appendix. More particularly, a concise overview and outline of important aspects of the invention are presented on pages 1-2 of "The Mousetrap Programmer's Guide." The language of the claims has been selected to follow the terminology presented in the programmer's guide. Similar terms are used throughout the specification.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his courtesy and suggestions during a telephone interview on September 19, 2001 and again on October 2, 2001.

Before addressing the merits of the rejections based on prior art, the Applicant provides the following brief description of the invention. The application is directed to a method for interrupting the normal operation of a Web browser operating on a recipient computer to provide predefined content data to an Internet user. Specifically, a Web site operating in accordance with the present invention is adapted to provide a Web browser operating on a recipient computer with Web site content data (i.e., first page data) and program instructions that modify the normal operation of the Web browser. When an Internet user instructs the Web browser to retrieve some user-defined content data (i.e., second page data) by depressing any of the toolbar buttons such as "Back", "Forward", or "Home", the Web browser will provide the Internet user with predefined

content data (i.e., third page data). This predefined content data (which is predefined by the Web site) is provided to the Internet user instead of, or in addition to, the user-defined content data. A Web site practicing the present invention can thus extend its access to an Internet user.

There are at least three distinct embodiments of the method of the invention. In one embodiment, program instructions for modifying the invention are inserted in a web page (e.g., HTML page) displayed on the browser to be modified. In another embodiment, the program instructions are in a frameset page for a displayed page. In a third embodiment, the program instructions are in a page displayed in a hidden frame of a multiple-frame frameset. The claims have been amended to clarify these aspects of the invention, with the three embodiments defined in independent method Claims 23, 30, and 37, respectively.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 4, 7, 9-11 and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mott in view of Kessenich. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Furthermore, the cited references do not bar patentability of the added Claims 23-64.

Mott fails to disclose or suggest providing program instructions in a page formatted for display in at least one frame of a computer that interact with a browser application operating on the computer, such as defined, for example, in Claim 37. It should be understood that Mott does not characterize the "client browser 219" as a general purpose browser such as is used for browsing Internet websites in the manner of the "browser" defined in Claims 23-64. Mott describes using its browser 219 only for making requests of the library server 260 (see col. 8, ll. 59-67; col. 10, l. 62 to col. 11, l. 8) which serves Mott's mobile playback devices. Also, the client browser of Mott is part of the "client computer system 214" as shown in Fig. 2, which may be downloaded or updated in its entirety (e.g., to replace an outdated version) from the library server 260 (col. 11, ll. 8-25, see also col. 8, ll. 42-48). It is clear that the software comprising the client browser of Mott is entirely determined and controlled by the library server, and the browser is a dedicated, special purpose browser for use with Mott's mobile playback

system. Mott therefore discloses nothing more than placing independently operated software on a client computer that is programmed to contact a server and download information from it.

This is a far cry from placing the program instructions in a page formatted for display in a frame of a browser, or a related frameset page, as defined by Claims 23-64. There would be no motivation to do so in Mott, because the operation of the browser in Mott is totally under the control of the server. In contrast, the browser as defined by Claims 23-64 is independent of the server supplying the program instructions, i.e., it may be supplied by an independent source. The program instructions are therefore supplied in a page configured according to browser protocol to interact with the browser.

Mott further fails to disclose or suggest configuring the program instructions to be activated by a page-unloading or frameset-unloading function of the browser while the page containing the program instruction is displayed. As defined by Claims 23-64, such page-unloading functions and frameset-unloading functions may be activated by requesting a second page for display on the recipient computer without selecting a link in the first page. Mott discloses nothing whatsoever in relation to the selection of links on a page, and much less the activation of program instructions in a displayed page by a selection event that is not the selection of a link. Mott further fails to disclose or suggest configuring the program instructions to automatically request a predetermined third page for display upon occurrence of the user-selection event.

Nor does Kessenich make up for these deficiencies of Mott. In col. 3, ll. 26-63 (cited by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action) and elsewhere, Kessenich describes a hierarchical organization of hyperlinks in categories on a website, where the website is associated with a particular printed book. Kessenich discloses the customary use of links to access web pages or information associated with each link, and fails to disclose or suggest anything further of relevance to the invention. In contrast, the present invention defines a method for interrupting, at least on a temporary basis, the usual operation of a link.

Serial No. 09/183,605  
October 3, 2001  
Page 18

Because Moot and Kessenich, both independently and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest numerous aspects of the invention, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the added claims, and the proposed combination therefore does not provide a basis for rejecting Claims 23-64.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

While the Applicant believes that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Brian M. Berliner  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,549

Date: October 3, 2001

**O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899  
Telephone: (213) 430-6000